

## **II. Remarks**

By this paper, Applicant is amending claims 1-3, 6, and 8. Previously, claim 14 had been cancelled by Amendment filed 04/20/2007. Therefore, claims 1-13 and 15-19 are currently pending.

Reconsideration and further examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is therefore respectfully requested.

### ***Claim Clarifications***

Claims 1-3, 6 and 8 have been amended to clarify, more particularly point out, and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as the subject matter of the present invention. Claim 1 has been amended to recite an *injection* mold and to positively claim the step of *increasing* the surface energy of the portion of the molded article for enhanced adhesion. Claims 2, 3, and 6 have been amended to refer to the injection mold recited in claim 1. Claim 8 has been amended to positively claim the step of *transferring* at least a portion of the heat energy of the thermoplastic resin to the substance. No new matter is added.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Stevenson et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0141620).

Applicant states that *Stevenson et al.* is not prior art to the present application. *Stevenson et al.* was filed on January 29, 2002 and published on July 31, 2003. Applicant's filing date is May 5, 2004, within one year from the publication date of *Stevenson et al.* Applicant further provides a declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 from the inventor. As shown in the enclosed declaration, the invention was conceived on or before December 3, 2001 (as shown in Exhibit A) and the inventor worked diligently towards a reduction to practice of the claimed subject matter from December 3, 2001 until at least May 5, 2004, when the invention was constructively reduced to practice by filing a patent application with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (as shown in Exhibits B through B). Therefore, Applicant has established that the claimed

subject matter was made prior to the effective date of *Stevenson et al.* Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable over the *Stevenson et al.*

Additionally, even if *Stevenson et al.* was prior art to the present application, *Stevenson et al.* fails to disclose the steps of applying a chlorinated polyolefin to the inner surface of an injection mold and increasing the surface energy of the portion of the molded article for enhanced adhesion, as recited in claim 1. Rather, *Stevenson et al.* discloses the step of applying a solution to an article post-molding. Additionally, *Stevenson et al.* discloses applying an anti-bacterial coating to the molded article rather than a solution for increasing the surface energy of the molded article. Therefore, *Stevenson et al.* would not disclose the steps recited in claim 1, even if *Stevenson et al.* is considered prior art to the present application.

Claims 2 and 5-7 depend from claim 1. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-2 and 5-7 should be withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 8-13 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stevenson et al.* in view of *Rechenberg et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0249075).

Applicant states that *Rechenberg et al.* is not prior art to the present application. *Rechenberg et al.* claims an effective filing date of February 15, 2002 and was published on December 9, 2004. Applicant's filing date is May 5, 2004, before the publication date of *Rechenberg et al.* Applicant further provides a declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 from the inventor. As shown in the enclosed declaration, the invention was conceived on or before December 3, 2001 (as shown in Exhibit A) and the inventor worked diligently towards a reduction to practice of the claimed subject matter from December 3, 2001 until at least May 5, 2004, when the invention was constructively reduced to practice by filing a patent application with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (as shown in Exhibits B through B). Therefore, Applicant has established that the claimed subject matter was made prior to the effective date of *Rechenberg et al.* Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable over the *Rechenberg et al.*

Additionally, even if *Rechenberg et al.* and *Stevenson et al.* were prior art to the present application, *Rechenberg et al.* would fail to cure the deficiencies of *Stevenson et al.* For example, *Rechenberg et al.* only discloses applying a coating to the molded article post-molding, rather than applying the solution to an inner surface of the mold as recited in claims 1, 8 and 16. Therefore, *Rechenberg et al.* and *Stevenson et al.* would not render claims 8 and 16 obvious even if they were considered prior art to the present application.

Claims 3, 4 depend from claim 1, claims 9-13 and 15 depend from claim 8, and claims 17-19 depend from claim 16. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, the Examiner's rejections of claims 3, 4, 8-13 and 15-19 should be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicant via telephone number (312) 245-5390, if such communication would expedite this application.

Respectfully submitted,

July 24, 2008

Date

  
Jon H. Beaupre (Reg. No. 54,729)

Enclosures:

Declaration of the Inventor Under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 and Attachments thereto  
Petition for Extension of Time